

### **Remarks**

In response to the Office Action dated 11 October 2006, applicant offers this Amendment. Reconsideration and reevaluation of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

5 Examiner objected to the Specification on the grounds that it lacked title headings between the different sections. Applicant has amended the Specification to include appropriate headings, and it is therefore submitted that these objections should be withdrawn.

10 Examiner objected to the disclosure due to an informality on page 11, line 14 regarding reference numeral 64. Examiner will note that this numeral has been corrected to 43 and it is therefore submitted that this objection should be withdrawn.

15 Examiner also objected to Claims 5, 6, 8 and 14 as the term "the body" lacked antecedent basis; to Claim 7 as the term "the plurality of longitudinally planar sections" lacked antecedent basis; and to Claim 16 as the term "locating one or more further" should be "one or more tools further". Examiner will note that Claims 5, 6 and 7 have been deleted. Also, as will be discussed below, the "body" has been introduced into Claim 1. Finally, the word "tools" has been introduced into Claim 16, as suggested by the Examiner. It is therefore submitted that these objections should be withdrawn.

20

Examiner will note that certain other amendments have been made to the Specification and Claims, notably at pages 10, 11 and 12 and to drawing Figures 1 and 2. Applicant submits that these amendments have clear basis in the Application as originally filed, and are appropriate and allowable under the circumstances.

25

Examiner went on to reject Claims 1-6, 8, 16, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerstenkorn in view of Carothers; Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-10, 14, 16, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reynolds in view of Carothers; Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reynolds in view of Carothers as applied to claim 9 and further in view of Niimi; and Claims 12 and 13 as being unpatentable over Reynolds in view of Carothers as applied to Claim 9 and further in view of Brisco and Crowe. Claims 7, 15 and 17 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant has amended the Claims in response to the objections raised by the Examiner, and submits that the invention defined by the new Claims is novel and inventive over the disclosures of the documents cited by the Examiner.

In more detail, Applicant has amended old Claim 1 to incorporate the features of old Claims 2, 5, 6 and 7, with certain modifications to the Claim language used and a restructuring of the Claim, for clarity. In addition, Claim 1 has been amended to delete reference to the drive system being a "hex" drive system (which feature was introduced during the International Phase). It is submitted that the amendments to old Claim 1 have clear basis in the Application as originally filed in the above Claims and at page 4, lines 28 and 29; page 5, lines 13-15, 17-21 and 23-28. In particular, it will be noted that the above features of Claims 2, 5, 6 and 7, discussed at pages 4 and 5, do not require that the drive system be a hex drive system. Following the Examiner's comments that old Claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and the Examiner's views concerning the hex drive feature, Applicant reiterates his belief that the invention defined by new Claim 1 is novel and inventive over the disclosures of Gerstenkorn in view of Carothers, and over Reynolds in view of Carothers.

Independent method Claim 16 has been amended to refer to the tool of Claim 1, and has

also been amended along similar lines to Claim 1 and thus reference to a "hex" drive system has been deleted. Basis for these amendments is found in the portions of the Application as filed discussed above. As the method now refers to Claim 1, and defines steps corresponding to the apparatus features which the Examiner has indicated distinguish the invention over the cited references, Applicant reiterates his belief that the invention defined by new Claim 16 is also novel and inventive over the disclosures of Gerstenkorn in view of Carothers, and over Reynolds in view of Carothers.

Following the above amendment to Claim 1, old Claims 2 and 5-7 have been deleted. Also, Claims 3, 4 and 8-14 are ultimately dependent upon Claim 1, and Claims 18 and 19 upon Claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the remaining rejected Claims have either been deleted or are ultimately dependent upon acceptable base Claims, and thus that the remaining Claim rejections should be withdrawn.

New Claims 20 to 25 have been added. Claim 20 is dependent on Claim 1 and reintroduces the "hex" drive feature; new Claim 21 is based upon old Claim 1, modified to incorporate the features of old Claims 2, 5, 6 and 7 whilst retaining the "hex" drive feature; new Claim 22 is based upon old Claims 1, 14 and 15; new Claim 23 is based upon old Claims 16 and 17; new Claim 24 is based upon old Claims 1, 14 and 15 and amended to modify references to a "hex" drive system to a "drive system" (support for which is found in the portions of the specification mentioned above); and new Claim 25 is based upon old Claims 16 and 17, again amended to modify references to a "hex" drive system modified to a "drive system". Following the Examiner's comments that old Claims 7, 15 and 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and the Examiner's views concerning the hex drive feature, Applicant reiterates his belief that the invention defined by new Claims 20 to 25 is novel and inventive over the disclosures of the references cited by the Examiner, taken singly or in combination.

Please also amend drawing Figures 1 and 2 as shown in the enclosed copy of the drawings, where the amendments are marked in red. The Figures have been amended to refer to portions 44a and 44b of the body 12 and sleeve 24, respectively. Hence, Applicant submits four (4) sheets of drawings, including two (2) sheets marked-up in red, and two (2) Replacement Sheets.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present Application is now in order for acceptance, and requests favourable reconsideration thereof. If it would aid in the disposition of this matter, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned. Action at an early date is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

15

26-Feb-2007


Date

20


C. Dean Domingue

C. Dean Domingue, Reg. No. 35,795  
Perret Doise, APLC  
Post Office Box 3408  
Lafayette, Louisiana 70502-3408  
Phone 337.262.9000  
Fax 337.262.9001  
**Customer No. 29166**

# Annotated Marked-Up Drawings



# Annotated Marked-Up Drawings



**FIG. 2**